

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

INGINIO HERNANDEZ,)	3:13-cv-00083-MMD-WGC
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u>
vs.)	
)	March 7, 2016
RENEE BAKER, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants)	
)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: KATIE LYNN OGDEN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Before the court is Plaintiff's motion requesting that the court order the Defendants to return to Plaintiff his Objections (ECF No. 168) to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. (ECF No. 174.) Plaintiff also states the order granting him a \$10.00 copy work extension has "been denied by the DOC facility." (*Id.* at 3.)

On January 5, 2016, the court granted Plaintiff's earlier motion (ECF No. 167) wherein he sought the court to return his only copy of his objections. The order also granted Plaintiff a copy work extension of \$10.00. (ECF No. 169.) In Plaintiff's instant motion, he states that when he received the copy of his objections from the court on January 8, 2016, he used that copy to serve upon the defendants on January 13, 2016, and now does not have a copy of it. (ECF No. 174 at 4.)

Plaintiff's writing style is difficult to discern, but it now appears that the court may have misunderstood Plaintiff's earlier motion (ECF No. 172) wherein Plaintiff asked for an extension of time and a copy of the "motion" he sent to counsel on January 18th. Plaintiff's request for an extension of time was denied as moot. The court further noted further that there were no outstanding motions or responses to which a response or reply was due, and directed Defendants to send a copy of Plaintiff's notice entitled Exhibit "L" (ECF No. 171) to Plaintiff. (ECF No. 173.)

The court notes Exhibit L attached a Copy Work Request by Plaintiff wherein he was denied the ability to copy 89 pages because he was over his copywork limit. Plaintiff's objections, ECF No. 168, consisted of approximately 90 pages. The court now interprets Plaintiff's motion that he was trying to copy his lengthy objections in order to serve them on the Defendants. Since he sent his only copy to Defendants, Plaintiff is now asking the court to order Defendants to return his objections to him. (ECF No. 174.)

